

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD

M.1.1 AWARD SELECTION: The Offeror whose offer conforms to the requirements of the solicitation and provide the best value to the FAA will be selected for award. The best value is defined as the proposal that present the most advantageous solution to the FAA, based on the evaluation of technical approach, business/management approach, price and other factors specified in the SIR. The best value approach provides the opportunity for technical cost/price trade-offs and does not require that award be made to either the Offeror submitting the highest rated proposal or the Offeror submitting the lowest price, although the ultimate award may be to either one of those Offerors.

Each offer will be evaluated separately, and in evaluating the proposals, the Government may conduct written or oral communications with any and/or all Offerors, and may reduce the firms participating in the competition to only those Offerors most likely to receive award. Additionally, the FAA reserves the right to conduct discussions and negotiations with any individual competing Offeror, or all competing Offerors, as the situation warrants. Discussions with one or more Offerors does not require discussions with all Offerors.

If, at any point during the evaluation of proposals, the FAA concludes based on information submitted by an Offeror orally or in writing that the Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving an award, then that Offeror may be rendered no longer eligible for award and eliminated from further consideration. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

The FAA reserves the right not to make an award if such action is in its best interest.

Offerors are cautioned not to minimize the importance of a detailed adequate response in any one of the factors due to its not being numerically scored.

M.1.2 ORDER OF IMPORTANCE: The basis for award will be made against the evaluation factors contained in section M and the FAA's characterization of the risk involved in making an award to an Offeror. All factors will be considered in the evaluation for award. The following evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance. Technical is the most important factor, followed by Business/Management, followed by Past Performance, followed by Price.

The Technical and Business Management factors will be scored numerically. Price will be evaluated for reasonableness and realism and will not be numerically scored. Past Performance will be evaluated as either Acceptable or Unacceptable. As technical differences between offers becomes smaller, the more important the Business/Management approach becomes, then Past performance, then price.

M.1.3 ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD: To be eligible for award, the Offeror must meet all the requirements of the SIR. However, the FAA reserves the right to reject any and all offers, waive any requirements, minor irregularities and discrepancies, if it would be in the best interest of the FAA to do so.

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1.4 AWARD ON INITIAL OFFERS: Upon evaluation of proposals, the FAA reserves the right to award a contract immediately following the conclusion of any evaluation, and may not require discussions or negotiations with the successful Offeror or any other Offeror. Therefore, it is critical that each offer be fully responsive to this SIR and its provisions. All submittals in response to a SIR should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price, technical, and business and management standpoint. If the FAA awards on initial offers, the basis for award remains best value and, therefore, the successful Offeror may not have submitted the lowest price or have the highest technical score.

M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS:

The following four (4) evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate the Offerors and are listed in descending order of importance.

FACTOR 1 - TECHNICAL APPROACH

SUBFACTOR – 1.1 – Transition of Legacy NAIMES Systems. Knowledge of the activities associated with Implementation, In-Service Management and Disposition of Information Technology Systems to Complete Transition of NAIMES Systems.

SUBFACTOR – 1.2 - Program and Operations. Knowledge of the activities associated with Implementation, In-Service Management and Disposition of Information Technology Systems to meet SIR requirements and objectives.

FACTOR 2 - BUSINESS/MANAGEMENT APPROACH

SUBFACTOR - 2.1 - Program Management Plan (PMP). The PMP will be evaluated based on the Offerer's ability to demonstrate an understanding of the NAIMES II requirement and provide a complete plan that realistically addresses the PMP elements:

SUBFACTOR - 2.2 - Transition Plan. The transition plan will be evaluated based on the Offerer's demonstrating an understanding of the NAIMES II requirements, risk, schedule constraints and unknowns. The Transition Plan must demonstrate that the Offerer understands the complexity of the transition and provides an effective and realistic plan to ensure transition success.

SUBFACTOR 2.3 - Resumes

Demonstration that key personnel have the education, knowledge and experience to meet minimum requirements in Section H and achieve program objectives.

FACTOR 3 - PAST PERFORMANCE

FACTOR 4 – PRICE

SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.3 EVALUATIONS

M.3.1.1 The Offeror's proposals will be evaluated based upon their written proposal and any discussions. Each of the evaluations factors and subfactors will be evaluated based on the Offeror's proposed approach, and understanding.

M.3.1.2 The technical proposal will be used to enable the Technical Evaluation Team to assess each Offeror's level of familiarity with understanding of the work to be performed under the resultant contract. Technical proposals will be evaluated to obtain capability information and assess the effectiveness of the Offerors' response to the SIR.

M.3.1.3 The evaluation of the technical proposal will utilize the following evaluation criteria:

- a. **Approach** – The degree to which the technical approach demonstrates comprehension of the requirements and the necessary resources to implement a successful program.
- b. **Understanding** – The degree to which the technical approach for implementing the requirements is logical, feasible, and achievable given the requirements. The degree that the technical performance and schedule risks are identified and mitigated.
- c. **Soundness** – The validity and achievability of the selected technical approach.

M.4 DOWN SELECT PROCESS:

Tiered Evaluations:

A tiered evaluation of offers will be used in this source selection, and offers will be categorized and evaluated in tiers following the process described below:

The tiered order of precedence for evaluating offers in this SIR are as follows in order of evaluation:

First, Socially and Economically Disadvantage (SEDB) expressly certified by the Small Business Administration (SBA) for participation in SBA's 8(a) program;

then, Service-disabled veteran owned small business (SDBOSB);

then, Very Small Business;

then, Small Business; and

then any other submissions.

Once offers are received, the CO will evaluate a single tier of offers according to the order of precedence specified above. If no award can be made at the first tier, the evaluation will proceed to the next lower tier until award can be made.

(a) First Tier Technical Evaluation. The First tier evaluation will only consider proposals from vendors in the small business socio-economic categories cited above. Offers from large business concerns will only

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

be considered after the determination that less than three qualified small business responses were received. Qualified is defined as: 1) receiving a combined Technical Approach and Business Management Approach total score of 80% (80 points out of 100 points) 2) no critical risk ratings for any of the evaluation factors or subfactors and 3) receiving an Acceptable rating for past performance.

(b) Second Tier Technical Evaluation. The Second tier evaluation will evaluate large business proposals along with small business proposals that have proceeded to the second tier evaluation. First large business proposals are evaluated by the technical evaluation team to determine if they meet the minimum qualifications. Qualified is defined as: 1) receiving a combined Technical Approach and Business Management Approach total score of 80% (80 points out of 100 points) 2) no critical risk ratings for any of the evaluation factors or subfactors and 3) receiving an Acceptable rating for past performance.

Then all qualified first and second tier vendors are ranked based on Approach total score, Understanding total score and Risk total score. The top ranked vendors are selected for advancement to Best Value determination. Vendor cut-off may be determined at a point where the ranking indicates an obvious break separating top ranked vendors from lower ranked vendors.

M. 5 PAST PERFORMANCE

M.5.1 The Offeror's Past Performance will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Offerors are to note that in conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the FAA will use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other Government sources. The following definitions apply:

Acceptable – The Offeror's product or service satisfies the government Minimum requirements as specified in the SIR. Few weaknesses exist which are likely to affect overall program schedule, product quality or performance.

Unacceptable – The Offeror's product or service does not meet the minimum requirements as specified in the SIR. Expected program schedules, product or performance are likely to be impacted by the Offerors' proposed solution.

M.5.2 Successful past performance will be evaluated based upon input received from individuals and organizations familiar with the work ethic, and standards of the Offeror as demonstrated through previous or ongoing contracts of a similar nature. Offeror's will be assessed as to whether their company/proposed team/subcontractor have complied a track record of quality work, timeliness of performance, satisfied customers, and demonstrated cost and schedule control procedures.

M.5.3 Each Offeror will be evaluated on its performance under existing and prior contracts for similar services. Performance information may be used for both responsibility determinations and as evaluation factor against which Offeror's relative rankings will be compared to assure best value to the FAA. A Performance Survey Form, prepared by the FAA, will be used to collect this information. References other than those identified by the Offeror may be contacted by the FAA with the information received and used in the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance.

M.5.4 The Government reserves the right to contact prior clients of the Offeror and to use the results in this evaluation.

SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.6 PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The total evaluated base period and four options years for each area will be considered in making award decision. **Price will not be scored in the evaluation of proposals.** The price proposal will be assessed to the completeness, process reasonableness and price realism of each Offer's response, the confidence level in the Offeror's ability to provide resources at the proposed prices and whether the pricing methodology appears to be well developed and substantiated. A definition for completeness, reasonableness and realism are as follows:

Completeness: Responsiveness in providing all SIR requirements. Review of the proposal to ensure data provided is sufficient to allow for complete analysis and evaluation of the prices delineated in Section B and includes all the information and exhibits required by Section L.

Reasonableness: An assessment as to whether the proposed price does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in performing the required effort. Prices that are unreasonably low and/or do not realistically consider market condition, inflation, deflation and general economic conditions will not be considered for award

Realism: An assessment of the level of confidence and reliability placed in the Offeror's proposed price elements and whether they produce a realistic proposed price based upon Government requirements and the Offeror's proposed technical approach. Therefore, the price evaluation will also determine additional inherent cost uncertainties within each Offeror's proposal. The price evaluation team will identify variables and/or discrepancies within an Offeror's proposal.

M.7 RISK ANALYSIS

M.7.1 Risk assessment analysis serves to assess and evaluate potential risks to the Government associated with the selection of each Offeror's overall proposal for fulfilling the requirements of the SIR. Risk is defined as the Government's degree of confidence that the Offeror will successfully meet performance baseline implicitly or explicitly incorporated into the proposal, that the solutions proposed will successfully meet the requirements of the SIR, and that the benefits in relation to the subfactors will be realized. Risk will be rated from negligible risk to critical risk. The primary criteria to be used in the assessment of risk will be the degree to which the Offeror substantiates the ability to meet schedule, price and performance components of the SIR. The evaluation of risk will also focus on whether each proposal volume supports and is logically consistent with information supplied in other volumes. It will also examine any unsubstantiated representations made in any proposal volume.

M.7.2 Risk will be identified at factors and subfactors level. Risk elements assessed may not be assigned equal importance in determining the overall degree of risk to the Government inherent in each Offeror's proposal. Therefore, a single unmitigated risk item may pose such a high degree of uncertainty as to cause the entire proposal to be determined as high risk to the Government. The FAA will assess risk throughout the evaluation.

Risk will be rated as follows

CRITICAL. Serious disruptions of schedule, increases in cost or degradation of performance
Mitigation not expected to be effective

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

HIGH. Likely to cause serious disruptions of schedule, increases in cost or degradation of performance even with special emphasis and close monitoring

MODERATE. Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increases in cost, or degradation of performance, but with special emphasis and close monitoring of the contractor, will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

LOW. Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increases in cost, or degradation of performance. With normal effort/monitoring will probably overcome difficulties.

NEGLIGIBLE. Has no discernable potential to cause disruption of schedule, increases in cost, or degradation of performance. Monitoring will probably not be necessary.

M.8 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS AMS 3.2.4-31 (April 1996)

Except when it is determined not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).